

Judge Richard A. Jones

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

DOMINGO VENEGAS-RAMIREZ,  
OSWALDO CAMACHO-MONTERO, and  
FERNANDO RODRIGUEZ-PENA,

Defendants.

NO. CR14-198RAJ

ORDER CONTINUING TRIAL  
AND PRETRIAL MOTIONS DEADLINE

THIS MATTER is before the Court on the joint motion of the government and the three defendants who have made an appearance in the above-captioned case (Domingo Venegas Ramirez, Oswaldo Camacho-Montero, and Fernando Rodriguez-Pena) to continue the trial in this matter.

HAVING CONSIDERED this motion, the file and the records in this case, the Court finds that the ends of justice are served by granting the continuance. The Court further finds that this case involved a lengthy investigation into multiple defendants. This investigation included six different interception orders and the interception of nine different telephones. Accordingly, the government has produced over 4000 pages of Bates-stamped discovery, as well as audio recordings of intercepted calls, text messages, and linesheets. The government has prepared substantial amount of electronic discovery (including photographs and surveillance videos) for production, as well. The government

1 has filed notice of related case for two other large, multi-defendant cases, *United States v.*  
2 *Hernandez-Moreno, et al.*, CR 14-197RAJ and *United States v. Saucedo-Macias, et al.*,  
3 CR 14-200RAJ, and the discovery for this investigation has been produced to all  
4 defendants' in these cases. The Court finds that defendants speak Spanish and in some  
5 instances, the assistance of an interpreter is required for the review of discovery. Finally,  
6 the defendants have agreed to file speedy trial waivers to accommodate the requested  
7 continuance.

8 THE COURT FINDS THAT given the extensive amount of discovery material,  
9 the number of defendants, and the need for counsel to review this material with  
10 defendants and in some cases with an interpreter, the failure to grant the requested  
11 continuance would unreasonably deny defense counsel the time necessary to prepare for  
12 trial, taking into consideration the exercise of due diligence. Accordingly, the ends of  
13 justice served by a continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the  
14 defendants in a speedy trial.

15 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the joint motion of the parties (Dkt. #44) is  
16 GRANTED. Trial shall be continued from September 15, 2014 to May 11, 2015, and the  
17 time between the date of this order and the new trial date is excludable pursuant to 18  
18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(6), 3161(h)(7)(A), 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii), 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).

19 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all pretrial motions, including motions in  
20 limine, shall be filed no later than March 12, 2015.

21  
22 

23 The Honorable Richard A. Jones  
24 United States District Judge  
25  
26  
27  
28